



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,377	02/18/2000	Miki Yamada	04329.2231	8206
22852	7590	12/29/2004	EXAMINER	
FINNEMAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/506,377	YAMADA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew Heneghan	2134

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Matthew Heneghan.

(3) _____.

(2) Attorney D. Kent Stier.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2004

Time: 1 PM EST

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

n/a

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Attorney Stier requested status of an after-final amendment and a notice of appeal filed in October 2004. The Examiner stated that the PALM system shows the filing of the amendment, but not the Notice of Appeal, while the IFW file shows the Notice of Appeal but not the amendment. Applicant might therefore wish to call and verify that all submitted papers have been properly recorded. It is noted that, since Appelants are permitted a five-month extension to the two-month period for submitting Appeal Briefs after properly filing a Notice of Appeal, the case should not be in danger of the case being declared as abandoned until May 2005..

D. O. M.
D. O. M.
REGURU MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100